



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,544	06/09/2006	Keiichi Matsushita	0670-7077	4764
31780	7590	04/01/2009	EXAMINER	
ERIC ROBINSON			CHAKOUR, ISSAM	
PMB 955			ART UNIT	
21010 SOUTHBANK ST.			PAPER NUMBER	
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,544

Applicant(s)

MATSUHASHI, KEIICHI

Examiner

ISSAM CHAKOUR

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the argument and remarks made by the applicant filed on 12/24/2008.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed (See response to arguments section).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it discloses "A computer program" which is currently held to be non-statutory subject matter.

According to MPEP, chapter 2100:

FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL: "DATA STRUCTURES" REPRESENTING DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL PER SE OR COMPUTER PROGRAMS REPRESENTING COMPUTER LISTINGS PER SE

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Subject matter as "computer program having instruction stored on a computer readable medium" may be applied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chavez (US 5,550,896).
3. Regarding claim 1, Chavez discloses a roaming system comprising: one or more controllers (e.g. switching node, see Column 3, lines 15-16) provided for each of zones that constitute a wireless network; and a server (e.g. the mobility management application and network management systems, see Column 4, lines 21 and 31 respectively) communicatively connected to the controllers in the zones, wherein each of the controllers comprises storage means that stores (see Column 3, lines 27) identification information or authentication information (see Column 3, lines 24) given to wireless terminals for receiving a service, the wireless terminals being registered with the zone in which the controller resides, and each controller operates to detect the identification information on a wireless terminal from the storage means when a request for the service is received from the wireless terminal, and to provide the service to the wireless terminal if the identification information is detected or to issue a query or request for checking outside (from switching node 110 to mobility management application or network management system depending on the hierarchy) for the presence of the identification information (an integral part of the TSP, see column 4, line 19-20) if the identification information is not detected (see Column 4, lines 52-59); and the server is adapted to maintain information indicating which controller in which zone stores the identification information on the wireless terminals, and the server operates to, on receiving the query, detect a

controller that stores the identification information on the wireless terminal for which the identification information is not detected, to communicate with the detected controller to confirm the presence of the identification information (See column 4, lines 61-65) on the wireless terminal which identification information is not detected, and to allow the controller that has issued the query to provide the service to the confirmed wireless terminal (see Column 4, lines 24-31 and lines 45-65).

4. In claim 2, Chavez discloses the roaming system according to claim 1, wherein the server is integrated with one of the controllers (see Column 4, lines 16-17).

5. Regarding claim 3, Chavez teaches the roaming system as indicated above according to claim 1 and 2 respectively. Chavez does not teach explicitly the server such that it operates to prohibit provision of the service to the confirmed wireless terminal if the query is received from a controller in a particular zone. However, in a roaming system, there is an interface function responsible for authenticating and deciding the provision or prohibition of service because when the user moves to a site outside his/her assigned controller there must be a decision interface that tests for authentication of the user and decides the provision or prohibition of the service depending on the contract or the user profile, else the service will not be provided outside the region of coverage of the assigned controllers.

6. Regarding claim 4, Chavez discloses a mobile communication system that allows access to a single directory information tree (e.g. network management systems, see Column 4, line 30

and item 115 in figure 1) from a plurality of directory servers (e.g. the mobility management application) corresponding to a plurality of sites in a mobile communication network, and comprises a plurality of authentication controllers (e.g. switching nodes, see Column 3, lines 14) provided in the respective sites for authenticating mobile communication terminals that request a service at each site, and wherein each of the plurality of authentication controllers comprises:

search request generation means that acquires identification information on a mobile communication terminal and generates a search request directed to the directory server when a request for a service is received from the mobile communication terminal;

search request transmission means that transmits the search request generated by the search request generation means to the directory server in the corresponding sites; and

authentication processing means that determines whether or not to permit provision of the service to the mobile communication terminal based on a search result acquired from the directory server (see Column 3, lines 6-26. Even though the feature of permission or denial of service based on search results is not explicitly mentioned, it is inherent in roaming systems as it allows the service provider to selectively provide the service based on their profile and initial selection of plans), and wherein each of the plurality of servers comprises: storage means that stores identification information given to mobile communication terminals for receiving a service, the mobile communication terminals being registered with the site corresponding to the directory server; identification information detection means that detects, from the storage means, the identification information on a mobile communication terminal specified in the search request from the authentication controller or in the search request redirected from a directory server corresponding to another site; search request redirection means that redirects the search

request from the authentication controller to a directory server located above or below (see Column 16, lines 6-13) in the directory information tree among the directory servers corresponding to other sites when the identification information on the mobile communication terminal is not detected by the identification information detection means; and search result provision means that provides a search result indicating success in detection of the identification information to the authentication controller when the identification information on the mobile communication terminal is detected in the other directory server to which the search request has been redirected by the search request redirection means, or in the identification information detection means, and wherein the authentication processing means operates to determine to permit provision of the service to the mobile communication terminal when the search result indicating success in detection of the identification information on the mobile communication terminal is acquired from the directory server (see Column 3, lines 23-42 and claim 7).

7. Regarding claim 5, Chavez further teaches the mobile communication system according to claim 4, wherein: each directory server comprises reference information storage means that stores address information on another directory server located above or below in the directory information tree (See claim 7, Column 22, line 9-19); and the search request redirection means operates to refer to the address information stored in the reference information storage means and to redirect the search request to the other directory server located above or below in the directory information tree (See claim 7, Column 21, line 53-59). Note that the communication and request messages for authentication between switching nodes entail that each switching nodes has

addresses of others above or below in the hierarchy by which the communication is possible, thus this feature is inherent).

8. Regarding claims 6, 8, and 9 Chavez teaches a mobile communication system that allows access to a single directory information tree having a hierarchical tree structure from a plurality of server apparatus, wherein of the plurality of server apparatuses comprises:

entry management means that stores entries in a directory provided in a subtree in the directory information tree, an attribute value of each entry being identification information given to any one of the mobile communication terminals which are able to provide a service in a mobile communication network (See column 4, lines 62-65 and column 9, lines 16-39);

Identification information detection means that detects the identification information on a mobile communication terminal among the attribute values of the entries stored in the directory by the entry management means (column 15, lines 59-61);

Search request transmission means that transmits a predetermined search request to another server apparatus located above or below in the directory information tree when the identification information or the authentication information on the mobile communication terminal is not detected by the identification information detection means (See column 15, line 36 and lines 59-61);

and service provision control means that allows provision of the service to the mobile communication terminal when the identification information on the mobile communication terminal is detected in the other server apparatus to which the search request has been transmitted by the search request transmission means, or in the identification information

detection means, and that prohibits provision of the service to the mobile communication terminal when no other server apparatus is located above or below in the directory information tree or when the identification information on the mobile communication terminal is not detected in the other server apparatus to which the search request has been transmitted by the search request transmission means (See column 15, line 27-29).

9. Regarding claim 7, Chavez teaches the mobile communication system according to claim 6, wherein: each server apparatus comprises reference information storage means that stores address information on another server apparatus located above or below in the directory information tree (See claim 7, Column 22, line 9-19); and the search request transmission means operates to refer to the address information stored in the reference information storage means and to transmit the search request to the other server apparatus located above or below in the directory information tree (See claim 7, Column 21, line 53-59).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "...each of the controllers has the identification information for only the wireless terminals belonging to the zone in which that controller resides and each controller does not have the identification information on all the wireless terminals in the wireless network...") are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For the sake of clarifying in the reference, claim 1 elements are being interpreted as follow: The switching node 108 is the resident controller or home zone controller, switching node 110 is the visited switching node or simply other controller, And the mobility management application on the higher hierarchy switching node, the identification information being authentication information or SPID identifying the TSP unique to each PCS, and PCS being the wireless terminal.

The applicant submits that Chavez does not teach each element in the claim and argues that the reference does not teach the claimed invention or the unique feature of the invention because Chavez discloses storing the authentication information in the visited switching node 110 after being retrieved from the mobility management, the latter that determines the home switching node that stores the authentication information, unlike the feature of the invention where there is no further storage of the authentication information in switching node that are being visited.

While Chavez does store *temporarily* in the switching node 110 the authentication information for the purpose of providing the service in addition to being stored in the mobility management application of the switching nodes in the subsequent hierarchy, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the traverse made by the applicant because the steps carried in claim 1 reads on Chavez disclosure as the elements of claim 1 are also functions performed in Chavez.

Additionally the examiner acknowledges the applicant that the controllers in claim 1 are not disclosed to have the identification information of only the wireless terminals that are residing in

and registered to said controllers (belonging to particular zone). In another word, the storage of identification information in a controller may include also wireless terminal that reside in different zones served by other controllers.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 8, and 9, the applicant submits that Chavez lacks disclosure to teach the claims and therefore the anticipation cannot be maintained. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the traverse made by the applicant regarding the claims. The examiner notes that the applicant in regards to these claims only asserts that Chavez does not explicitly or inherently teaches the claimed invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, and 7, the rejection is maintained as they inherit the deficiency of the independent claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISSAM CHAKOUR whose telephone number is (571) 270-5889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Perez Rafael can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/I. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617